

Reply to “Comment on ‘Low-temperature phonon thermal conductivity of single-crystalline Nd₂CuO₄: Effects of sample size and surface roughness’ ”

S. Y. Li,¹ J.-B. Bonnemaïson,¹ A. Payeur,¹ P. Fournier,^{1,2} C. H. Wang,³ X. H. Chen,³ and Louis Taillefer^{1,2,*}

¹*Département de physique and RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada*

²*Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, Canada*

³*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Science at Microscale and Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P. R. China*

(Dated: April 13, 2009)

In their comment² on our study of phonon heat transport in Nd₂CuO₄,¹ Sun and Ando estimate that the phonon mean free path at low temperature is roughly half the width of the single crystal used in our study, from which they argue that phonon scattering cannot be dominated by sample boundaries. Here we show that their use of specific heat data on Nd₂CuO₄, which contains a large magnetic contribution at low temperature that is difficult to reliably extract, leads to an underestimate of the mean free path by a factor two compared to an estimate based on the specific heat data of the non-magnetic isostructural analog Pr₂CuO₄. This removes the apparent contradiction raised by Sun and Ando.

PACS numbers: 72.15.Eb, 74.72.-h

Recently, we reported the effect of sample size and surface roughness on the phonon thermal conductivity κ_p of Nd₂CuO₄ single crystals down to 50 mK.¹ At 0.5 K, κ_p was shown to be proportional to $\sqrt{A}$, where A is the cross-sectional area of the sample. This clearly demonstrates that κ_p is dominated by boundary scattering at and below 0.5 K.

In their Comment,² Sun and Ando (SA) calculated the phonon mean free path l from our thermal conductivity data, using the formula $\kappa_p = C \langle v \rangle l/3$ where $C = \beta T^3$ is the phonon specific heat and $\langle v \rangle$ is a suitable average of the three acoustic sound velocities. Using $\beta = 0.42$ mJ/mol K⁴ for Nd₂CuO₄, they arrived at an estimate of l which is about 50% of the average sample width $W \equiv 2\sqrt{A/\pi}$. Because $l < W$, they concluded that phonons in our Nd₂CuO₄ single crystals did not reach the boundary scattering regime at low temperature.

Because their criticism is based entirely on a quantitative estimate of l , it would seem important to know the uncertainty in the parameters β and $\langle v \rangle$ used to arrive at this estimate. SA provide no indication of the uncertainty on their numbers. More problematic, however, is their use of specific heat data on Nd₂CuO₄ to estimate β . Indeed, because of the large magnetic contribution to $C(T)$ at low temperature coming from Nd³⁺ moments, SA had to make some assumptions to extract

the phonon component from that low-temperature data. An alternate and standard approach is to use the non-magnetic isostructural analog Pr₂CuO₄, for which there is no such magnetic contribution. The specific heat of Pr₂CuO₄ below 10 K readily yields $\beta = 0.19$ mJ/mol K⁴.³

If we use that value for β , which is half that used by SA for their estimate of l , we arrive at an estimated phonon mean free path which is twice as large. This removes the discrepancy which is the basis for their Comment. Note also that $\beta = 0.19$ mJ/mol K⁴ is in excellent agreement with the value of $\beta = 0.20$ mJ/mol K⁴ calculated by SA using the standard expression based on sound velocities (Eq.(2) in their Comment).

We conclude that as best as one can estimate it, the phonon mean free path in Nd₂CuO₄ at $T = 0.5$ K works out to be roughly equal to the average sample width, so that one can expect phonons to be scattered by boundaries below 0.5 K. In as-grown crystals with smooth, mirror-like faces, it is then reasonable to expect some specular reflection as the phonon wavelength gets longer and longer with decreasing temperature. The best way to verify this is to deliberately roughen those surfaces and see whether the thermal conductivity is reduced. The purpose of our article¹ was to show that it clearly does.

* E-mail: louis.taillefer@physique.usherbrooke.ca

¹ S. Y. Li, J.-B. Bonnemaïson, A. Payeur, P. Fournier, C. H. Wang, X. H. Chen, and Louis Taillefer, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 134501 (2008).

² X. F. Sun and Yoichi Ando, arXiv:0904.1704.

³ S. Ghamaty, B. W. Lee, J. T. Markert, E. A. Early, T. Bjornholm, C. L. Seaman, and M. B. Maple, Physica C **160**, 217 (1989).